

Emily Cooper OSB #182254  
ecooper@droregon.org  
Thomas Stenson OSB #152894  
tstenson@droregon.org  
Disability Rights Oregon  
511 SW 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
(503) 243-2081  
*Counsel for Plaintiff, Disability Rights Oregon*

Jesse Merrithew OSB #074564  
jesse@lmhlegal.com  
Levi Merrithew Horst PC  
610 SW Alder Street, Suite 415  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
(971) 229-1241  
*Counsel for Plaintiff, Metropolitan Public Defender*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON

DISABILITY RIGHTS OREGON,  
METROPOLITAN PUBLIC DEFENDER  
SERVICES INC., and A.J. MADISON,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

JAMES SCHROEDER, in his official  
capacity as head of the Oregon Health  
Authority, and DOLORES MATTEUCCI, in  
her official capacity as Superintendent of the  
Oregon State Hospital,

Defendants,

and

LEGACY EMANUEL HOSPITAL &  
HEALTH CENTER d/b/a UNITY CENTER  
FOR BEHAVIORAL HEALTH; LEGACY

Case No. 3:02-cv-00339-MO (Lead Case)  
Case No. 3:21-cv-01637-MO (Member Case)  
Case No. 6:22-cv-01460-MO (Member Case)

PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED AMENDMENTS  
TO SEPTEMBER ORDER REGARDING  
TRANSPORTATION FROM THE STATE  
HOSPITAL

HEALTH SYSTEM; PEACEHEALTH; and  
PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES,

Intervenors.

JAROD BOWMAN, JOSHAWN  
DOUGLAS-SIMPSON,

Plaintiffs,

DOLORES MATTEUCCI, Superintendent of  
the Oregon State Hospital, in her individual  
and official capacity, JAMES SCHROEDER,  
Direction of the Oregon Health Authority, in  
his official capacity, and PATRICK ALLEN  
in his individual capacity,

Defendants,

and

LEGACY EMANUEL HOSPITAL &  
HEALTH CENTER d/b/a UNITY CENTER  
FOR BEHAVIORAL HEALTH; LEGACY  
HEALTH SYSTEM; PEACEHEALTH; and  
PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES  
OREGON,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

JAMES SCHROEDER, in his official  
capacity as Director of Oregon Health  
Authority,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:21-cv-01637-MO (Member Case)

Case No. 6:22-cv-01460-MO (Member Case)

### LR 7-1 CERTIFICATION

The parties and amici conferred extensively regarding this proposed language as ordered by the Court and required by LR 7-1. The Defendants do not oppose this language. Amici counties do oppose this language.

### PROPOSED MODIFICATION

Pursuant to the Court's Order of March 31, 2023 (Dkt. No. 368), Plaintiffs submit the following proposed amendment to paragraph (3)(d) (edits underlined):

Before a patient reaches this maximum duration of commitment for restoration under this Order and remains unfit to proceed, OSH shall notify the committing court of the patient's impending discharge 60 days before the date on which the hospital is required to discharge the patient pursuant to this Order. The Sheriff's Office/Department in the committing jurisdiction shall transport and return the patient to the jail upon notification from OSH that the patient is ready for discharge, except that, where the patient and the committing jurisdiction agree, the Sheriff's Office in the committing jurisdiction will transport the patient to from OSH to another appropriate place. If there is a conflict between this order and the committing jurisdiction, the Supremacy Clause establishes this order takes precedence over any state court order pursuant to Article VI, paragraph 2 of the US Constitution.

And the following amendments to paragraph (3)(f):

No later than March 15, 2023, patients currently admitted at OSH who have exceeded the length of restoration set forth in this Order shall be discharged from their restoration commitment and from the hospital. The Sheriff's Office/Department in the committing jurisdiction shall transport and return the patient to the jail upon notification from OSH that the patient is ready for discharge except that, where the patient and the committing jurisdiction agree, the Sheriff's Office in the committing jurisdiction will transport the patient to from OSH to another appropriate place. If there is a conflict between this order and the committing jurisdiction, the Supremacy Clause establishes this order takes precedence over any state court order pursuant to Article VI, paragraph 2 of the US Constitution.

Plaintiffs rely upon their original motion to support this requested amendment which lays out why the county sheriffs for all practical purposes are the most appropriate

entity to transport patients from the hospital. Their participation is necessary to effectuate the remedial order issued by this Court, which the Court has already found is the least restrictive means of enforcing its injunction.

DATED this 9th day of March, 2023.

LEVI MERRITHEW HORST PC

/s/ Jesse Merrithew

Jesse Merrithew OSB # 074564

jesse@lmhlegal.com

610 SW Alder Street, Suite 415

Portland, Oregon 97205

Telephone: (971) 229-1241

Facsimile: (971) 544-7092

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Metropolitan Public  
Defender, Jarrod Bowman, and Joshawn  
Douglas-Simpson*

DISABILITY RIGHTS OREGON

/s/ Emily Cooper

Emily Cooper OSB # 182254

ecooper@droregon.org

Thomas Stenson, OSB # 152894

tstenson@droregon.org

511 SW 10th, Suite 200

Portland OR 97205

Telephone: (503) 243 2081

Facsimile: (503) 243 1738

*Counsel for Plaintiff Disability Rights  
Oregon*